



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/677,857	10/03/2000	Raja Singh Tuli		6205

7590 03/11/2004

JAMES C. SCHELLER JR.  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP  
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD  
SEVENTH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

BAROT, BHARAT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/677,857

Applicant(s)

TULI, RAJA SINGH

Examiner

Bharat N Barot

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6-7.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

**Specification**

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

**Drawings**

2. This application has been filed with informal drawings, which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

**Claim Objection**

3. Claims 1 and 3-7 are objected to because of the following informality: Claims 1 and 3-7 contain "whereby " should be --wherein--. Appropriate correction is required.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  
  
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 2-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "the host computer" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim 2.

Claims 3-6 recite the limitation "the portable display device" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims 3-6 because the claims 3-6 depend on claims 1-2 and claim 1 does not contains the limitation "a portable display device".

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yan et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,003,065). Yan's patent meets all the limitations for claim 1 recited in the claimed invention.

8. As to claim 1, Yan et al disclose a host computer which contains a server comprising software, in which multiple virtual machines each comprising software contains a web browser (processor), wherein each virtual machine communicates with a dedicated client (peripheral device) comprising another software which converts information received to a raster image, which is compressed and sent in a specific order to a dedicated modem port (see abstract; figure 1; column 6 line 52 to column 7 line 48; column 9 lines 43-62; and column 12 lines 4-26).

9. Claims 2-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nahi et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,084,584). Nahi's patent meets all the limitations for claims 2-6 recited in the claimed invention.

10. As to claim 2, Nahi et al disclose a portable display device remotely connected, which communicates with a dedicated client, receives compressed files from the host computer, and displays decompressed said files stored into internal memory in the specific order sent (see abstract; figures 1-2s; column 4 line 22 to column 5 line 6; column 12 line 49 to column 13 line 31).

11. As to claim 3, Nahi et al disclose that the display area of the portable device is smaller than the decompressed images stored in internal memory, such that the location of the display area is relayed to the client which sends compressed images in this area first then surrounding areas after (column 10 lines 15-26; column 19 line 26 to column 20 line 8; and column 22 lines 35-39).

12. As to claim 4, Nahi et al disclose that a mouse click or keyboard command from the portable display device is relayed immediately to the client, which sends a new image from the web browser to the portable display device if required, otherwise original activities are resumed (figures 2s-3; and column 7 line 60 to column 8 line 33).

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nahi et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,084,584).

15. As to claim 5, Nahi et al do not disclose that beacons are relayed between the portable display device and the client to confirm a telephone connection is established, such that a beacon not received is interpreted as a disconnection and a reconnection sequence to the same client is initiated, but it would have been obvious and known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to relays beacons between the portable display device and the client to confirm a telephone connection is established because it would have increased over all system efficiency and performance.

16. As to claim 6, Nahi et al do not disclose an error protocol verifies all files sent from the client to the portable display device are successfully received, decompressed and acknowledged by the portable display device such that any files containing errors; or files not received are sent again and placed in the corrected location, but it would have been obvious and known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to resends the files containing errors or not received in response to acknowledged by the portable display device because it would have increased over all system efficiency and performance.

17. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yan et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,003,065) in view of Nahi et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,084,584).

18. As to claim 7, Yan et al disclose a host computer which contains a server comprising software, in which multiple virtual machines each comprising software contains a web browser (processor), wherein each virtual machine communicates with a dedicated client (peripheral device) comprising another software which converts information received to a raster image, which is compressed and sent over the Internet to be viewed by a portable device comprising a display screen and related micro-electronics which can log on to the host computer (see abstract; figure 1; column 6 line 52 to column 7 line 48; column 9 lines 43-62; and column 12 lines 4-26).

However, Yan et al do not disclose that a portable device is able to decompress that image and display it on a display screen.

Nahi et al disclose a portable device remotely connected, which communicates with a dedicated client, receives compressed files from a host computer, and a portable device is able to decompress that image and display it on a display screen (see abstract; figures 1-2s; column 4 line 22 to column 5 line 6; column 12 line 49 to column 13 line 31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Nahi et al stated above in the system of Yan et al for decompressing that image and displaying it on a display screen as stated above because it would have increased over all system efficiency and performance by reducing network latency and processing time.



**Additional References**

19. The examiner as of general interest cites the following references.
  - a. Dent, U.S. Patent No. 6,418,310.
  - b. Butts et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,233,541.

**Contact Information**

1. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bharat Barot whose telephone number is (703) 305-4092. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alam, Hosain, can be reached at (703) 308-6662. A central official fax number is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Patent Examiner Bharat Barot

Art Unit 2155

March 05, 2004

*Bharat Barot.*  
**BHARAT BAROT**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**